

Message

From: Alexander, Shanna [Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/14/2021 3:50:01 PM
To: Froede, Carl [Froede.Carl@epa.gov]; Amoroso, Cathy [Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov]; Richards, Jon M. [Richards.Jon@epa.gov]
CC: Frederick, Tim [Frederick.Tim@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: ORR DRAT DQOs
Attachments: 2021-4-15_ORR-Rad-Fish-SAP-cmmts_SA.docx

Hi Carl,

SSS comments on the fish SAP are attached. My main concerns on the DQOs was largely covered by Cathy's comments so I am going to look these over again and share whatever differences in a separate email.

Thanks,



Shanna Alexander, DABT | Toxicologist
Scientific Support Section | Resource and Scientific Integrity Branch
Superfund and Emergency Response Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
61 Forsyth Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30303
☎ (404) 562-8635 | Email: Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov

From: Froede, Carl <Froede.Carl@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 6:02 AM
To: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>; Richards, Jon M. <Richards.Jon@epa.gov>; Alexander, Shanna <Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORR DRAT DQOs

Thank you Cathy.

From: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 5:21 PM
To: Froede, Carl <Froede.Carl@epa.gov>; Richards, Jon M. <Richards.Jon@epa.gov>; Alexander, Shanna <Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORR DRAT DQOs

Carl,
My comments on the SAP are attached – in two forms. One is comments directly in the document, and the other is a list in a Word document.

Cathy

From: Froede, Carl <Froede.Carl@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2021 3:04 PM
To: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>; Richards, Jon M. <Richards.Jon@epa.gov>; Alexander, Shanna

<Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: ORR DRAT DQOs

Importance: High

Good afternoon everyone:

Please - I will need your comments on the fish collection/analysis component of the Erratum for the Bear Creek RAR/CMP (SAP) by COB Thursday (April 15th) so that I can compile and submit them by email on Friday (April 16th).

I will also accept any DQO comments you may wish to share as they may relate to the fish collection/analysis work or not.

Do **not** believe that we will have another opportunity to resolve fish collection/analysis issues as DOE has demonstrated repeatedly that they **will not** retracing any past work that delays their construction of the new CERCLA landfill (i.e., EMDF). Once the fish are collected the DOE will move forward to the next "Prepare DQA" box. Please make sure that your issues with fish collection/analysis are identified even if they are not addressed by DOE (hopefully they will be addressed).

Please provide me with your comments in two categories: General Comments and Specific Comments. The Specific Comments will need to be referenced by Section and page number. If references are cited then please provide a References Cited list.

I will be out of the office tomorrow but will return on Monday.

Thank you very much for your help – you are appreciated.

Gratefully,

Carl

From: Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 3:50 PM

To: Froede, Carl <Froede.Carl@epa.gov>; Richards, Jon M. <Richards.Jon@epa.gov>; Alexander, Shanna <Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov>

Subject: ORR DRAT DQOs

What is the plan to get comments on the DQO? I have a few in mind.

Also, what is your opinion on the following:

I realize the fish consumption rate will be based on a place that may reasonably be expected to be fished. Should the fish tissue sampling – which provides the current conditions of fish in BC – include fish of various sizes and from various locations in BC (both upstream and downstream) of the landfill and the place where fishing is most likely to occur? I think so. I think I heard UCOR say that we would collect fish tissue in multiple locations, but now I'm not so sure that is the intent.

Cathy Amoroso, Chief
Restoration & DOE Coordination Section
Superfund & Emergency Management Division
U.S. EPA, Region 4
404-295-6758